

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8 and 16-17 are presently active, Claims 9-15 have been previously canceled without prejudice, Claims 1, and 16-17 are amended. No new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-8 and 16-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as indefinite. Claims 1 and 16-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Kitsutaka (U.S. Pat. No. 7,042,463). Claims 2-8 were objected to as dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Firstly, Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the indication of allowable subject matter in Claims 2-8. However, Claims 2-8 are presently maintained in dependent form, because Applicants believe that Claim 1 as currently amended includes allowable subject matter.

Regarding the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection, Claim 17 is amended to be directed to a computer readable storage medium, as suggested by the outstanding Office Action (Office Action at page 2, paragraph 2). Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection is overcome.

Regarding the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejection of Claims 1-8 and 16-17, Claims 1 and 16-17 are amended to recite “alpha blend said primitive-processed image over said image background, where alpha values of the edges of each primitive of said group of graphics primitives are determined by the anti-aliasing filtering,” as suggested by the outstanding Office Action (Office Action at page 2, paragraph 3). This step corresponds to Step 1520 of the non-limiting embodiment, and is fully supported by, for example, the

specification at page 17, lines 5-6. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejection is overcome.

Regarding the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of Claims 1 and 16-17, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection is overcome because, in Applicants' view, amended independent Claims 1 and 16-17 patentably distinguish over Kitsutaka as discussed below.

Claim 1 is amended to recite, *inter alia*, "second processing said original foreground image signals to draw said original foreground image over said alpha-blended primitive-processed image so that *only the anti-aliased edges which extend outside an area of said original foreground image remain exposed.*"

This amendment finds non-limiting support in Applicant's specification as originally filed, for example at page 15, lines 16-32, page 16, lines 3-9 and page 17, lines 4-6 and lines 8-9. Thus, no new matter is added.

Kitsutaka describes ascribing to an image an alpha-value corresponding to the depth (Z) value, and overlaying the alpha-blended image on a defocused version of the image. However, Kitsutaka does not disclose drawing the sharp original image over the alpha-blended image. Further, Kitsutaka does not disclose that *only the anti-aliased edges which extend outside an area of the original image remain exposed.*

In addition, in response to the note in the outstanding Office Action that "Applicant should note the second processing is not claimed to performed on the result of the first processing" (Office Action at page 3, lines 4-5), Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 is amended to clarify that the second processing is performed on the result of the first processing.

Thus, Kitsutaka fails to teach or suggest "second processing said original foreground image signals to draw said original foreground image over said alpha-blended primitive-

processed image so that *only the anti-aliased edges which extend outside an area of said original foreground image remain exposed*,” as recited in Claim 1.

Similar arguments set forth above apply to Claims 16-17.

Accordingly, independent Claims 1 and 16-17 patentably distinguish over Kitsutaka.

Therefore, Claims 1 and 16-17 and the pending Claims 2-8 dependent from Claim 1 are believed to be allowable.

Last, Applicants respectfully note that the amendment of “outputting a signal for displaying …” finds non-limiting support in Applicant’s specification as originally filed, for example at page 11, lines 26-27. Thus, no new matter is added.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the above discussions, it is believed that the outstanding rejection is overcome, and the application as amended herewith is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Scott A. McKeown
Registration No. 42,866

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

BDL\TY:pta
I:\ATT\TY\AMEND-RESPONSES\282536\282536 2ND PROPOSED RESPONSE DUE APRIL 3 2007.DOC